

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

GARY A. WIPPERMAN,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:08 MC 38

-vs-

O R D E R

WARDEN WILLIAMS, et al.,

Defendant.

KATZ, J.

This matter is before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff's motion for a temporary injunction. The Court notes the failure of Plaintiff to serve a copy upon the Defendant and that his motion is unsigned. Despite these missteps, the Court has considered Plaintiff's motion and finds it to be without merit.

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65, injunctive relief is an extraordinary remedy whose purpose is to preserve the status quo. In the Sixth Circuit it is well settled that the following factors are to be considered in making this determination:

(1) Whether the movant has shown a strong or substantial likelihood or probability of success on the merits; (2) Whether the movant has shown irreparable injury; (3) Whether the issuance of a preliminary injunction [TRO] would cause substantial harm to others; and (4) Whether the public interest would be served by granting injunctive relief.

Mason County Med. Ass'n v. Knebel, 563 F.2d 256, 261 (6th Cir. 1977).

In this instance, there has not been a showing of irreparable harm and the Court has confirmed Plaintiff's July 8, 2008 parole date remains firm.

For these reasons, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order and this case is now closed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ David A. Katz
DAVID A. KATZ
U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE